



ATTACHMENT A

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to an Office Action mailed on October 10, 2007. Claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 have been amended. Claims 41 – 47 have been canceled.

Rejection of claims 1 – 7, 10 – 17, 20 – 27, 30 – 37 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1 – 7, 10 – 17, 20 – 27, 30 – 37 and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hocker et al. ("Hocker") (U.S. Patent No. 5,943,678). This rejection is respectfully traversed, although independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 have been amended to more clearly define over the reference by making explicit that which was already implicit in the claims, and was explicitly argued in the previous response. Since the basic issues have already been considered, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments raise no new issues that require further search or consideration by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 are independent claims and have been rejected under a common rationale. Thus, the rejection of claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 will be commonly addressed, using claim 1 as representative of the group.

As explained in the Background of the Invention section of the present Application:

Today, users of information handling systems have access to a wide range of resources. For example, faster processors and expanded memory enable a user to operate more than one program at a time, as well as connect an increasingly greater variety of devices to the information handling system, such as printers, modems, touch pads, write pads, voice recognition devices, satellite information network access, etc. The variety and sheer number of available devices and resources connected to even one system may make tracking the performance and utilization of these resources near impossible, especially if the system is connected to a network. ... Additionally, a user may not have a clear idea of the past usage of the system. ... In some instances even when the past usage of a resource is stored, the user may

not determine the association of the resources.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method of generating a persistent usage context that addresses these issues, including:

monitoring usage of resources of the information handling system;

generating a first representation corresponding to a first item of usage;

generating a second representation corresponding to a second item of usage;

communicating an association of the first representation to the second representation so as to enable a determination of at least one of prior usage and current usage of resources of the information handling system.

Hocker states that “it is an object of the present invention to provide an improved system and method for retrieving prior versions of an application, database, or other function. A target GUI becomes a front-end for version storing software, such as HPOFS.” Col. 1, lines 54 – 58. (“HPFOS” is an acronym for IBM High Performance Optical File System, col. 1, lines 37 – 38.)

It is respectfully submitted that “a system and method for retrieving prior versions of an application, database, or other function” using a target GUI as a “front-end for version storing software, such as HPOFS,” as disclosed by Hocker, cannot be equated to monitoring usage of resources of an information handling system, as recited in claim 1 because “monitoring versions of data” is not the same as monitoring the usage of the resources of an information handling system.

It is alleged in the Office Action that Hocker teaches “monitoring usage (see column 3, lines 34 – 44; “*The VTT settings may be also be automatically determined by VTT software based on a user’s past usage*”, in order for a user’ past usage to be used, the user’s past usage must inherently be monitored) of an information handling system (see column 2, lines 25 – 40; “*The present invention is capable of running on any general purpose computer system or computer controlled GUI*”, a general purpose computer system is equivalent to an information handling system);”

Further, it is stated in the “Response to Arguments” section of the Office Action that:

The primary function of Hocker’s invention is monitoring usage of the system. Applicant is directed to Hocker column 3, lines 34 – 44, where Hocker explicitly states that usage is monitored by the system (*“The VTT settings may be also be automatically determined by VTT software based on a user’s past usage”*). Also, because the system taught by Hocker is write-once, all system activity is stored permanently, which is equivalent to monitoring usage of an information handling system.

The “VTT settings” in col. 3, lines 34 – 44 relate to a “time (including date) entered by [a] user to retrieve a version of data filed at the specified time.” The cited passage describes the VTT software reviewing the filing time of previous versions and displaying the version with the filing time closest to the selected time. The “automatic determination based on a user’s past usage” is “so that more likely settings are the default when a user drags a particular icon on top of the VTT icon.”

The cited passage discloses, at best, monitoring user entry of a historical time for which it is desired to retrieve a version of data, so that a default time can be determined. It is respectfully submitted that monitoring for user entry of a filing time of a previous version of data does not make the primary function of the invention “monitoring usage of the system,” as alleged. The primary function, to the extent that there is a “primary function,” of the system disclosed by Hocker is retrieving prior versions of data. It is further respectfully submitted that retrieving prior versions of data is unrelated to “monitoring usage of resources of an information handling system,” as recited in claim 1.

Further, with respect to the Examiner’s statement that “because the system taught by Hocker is write-once, all system activity is stored permanently, which is equivalent to monitoring usage of an information handling system,” it is respectfully submitted that Hocker does not disclose “permanently storing all system activity.” At best, Hocker discloses storing versions of an application, database, or other function for later retrieval. It is respectfully submitted that “storing versions of data” is not the same

as storing “all system activity,” and, therefore, Hocker does not disclose “monitoring usage of an information handling system,” as suggested. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that storing versions of data permanently on “write-once” media is completely irrelevant to method as recited in claim 1.

Still further, it is alleged in the Office Action that Hocker teaches “generating a first representation (see column 5 lines 1 – 8; ...) corresponding to a first item of usage (see column 1 lines 32 – 49; ...)”; and “generating a second representation corresponding to a second item of usage (see column 5 lines 1 – 8 and column 1 lines 32 – 49; ...).”

It is respectfully submitted that the “representations corresponding to items of usage” in the referenced passages are merely representations of stored versions of files, applications, databases, functions, etc. It is further respectfully submitted that representations of “versions” of data are not representations of the “usage” of the resources of a system, as recited in amended claim 1. As explained in the application, by utilizing representations depicting current and prior items of usage, such as the operation of an application or a peripheral device, a user may determine which programs are currently operating, which tasks are being performed, and the utilization by the program of devices connected to the system. This may also enable a user to determine the source of problems which occur on the system by viewing a usage history.

Lastly, it is suggested in the Office Action that Hocker teaches “communicating an association of the first representation to the second representation so as to enable a determination of at least one of prior usage and current usage of an information handling system (see column 5, lines 9 – 32).” Column 5, lines 9 – 32 of the Hocker reference disclose, *inter alia*, a “viewscreen that represents a tunnel in perspective in which time is represented along the length of the tunnel. Snapshots of data to be represented are visible in panels along the walls of the tunnel ...”

Since Hocker does not contain a teaching or suggestion of a first representation corresponding to a first item of usage or a second representation corresponding to a second item of usage, it is respectfully submitted that Hocker also does not contain a teaching or suggestion of communication an association of such a first representation to

such a second representation to enable a determination of at least one of a prior usage and a current usage of the system, as recited in claim 1. Further, it is respectfully submitted that “snapshots of data” which are visible in panels along the walls of a tunnel represented on a viewscreen can not be equated to representations of items of usage of an information handling system.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Hocker does not teach or suggest the steps recited in claim 1, and the invention as recited in claims 11, 21 and 31 by common rationale. Further, claims 2 – 7, 10, 12 – 17, 20, 22 – 27, 30, 32 – 37 and 40 depend from claims 1, 11, 21 and 31, and are allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of claim 1.

Rejection of claims 8, 9, 18, 19, 28, 29, 38 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 8, 9, 18, 19, 28, 29, 38 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hocker in view of Schwartz et al. (“Schwartz”) (U.S. Patent No. 5,047,918). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Schwartz does not overcome the deficiencies of Hocker described above. Therefore, for at least this reason, the proposed combination of Hocker and Schwartz does not teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 8, 9, 18, 19, 28, 29, 38 and 39.

Rejection of claims 41 – 47 under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 41 – 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauersfeld et al. (“Bauersfeld”) (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,679) and DeStefano (U.S. Patent No. 6,075,531). This rejection is respectfully traversed, however, in an effort to advance the prosecution of the application, claims 41 – 47 have been canceled. The Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of canceled claims 41 – 47 at a later time.

END REMARKS